



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/453,568	12/02/1999	AKIO SEKIYA	HAG 114	2817

23995 7590 01/21/2004

RABIN & Berdo, PC  
1101 14TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

GORT, ELAINE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/453,568

Applicant(s)

SEKIYA, AKIO

Examiner

Elaine Gort

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear in claim 8 what is meant by separate headings for expense, debit and credit accounts. It is unclear as debit and credit amounts may exist for each expense account and thus it is unclear if three headings are being claimed or one main heading describing the expense with sub-headings of debit and credit.

It is unclear in claim 12, line 11, what is being claimed in regard to "a plurality of at least N different kinds of said accounting screens". It is unclear what is being claimed if N is equal to zero? The claim claims in effect no accounting screens present. Perhaps this could be clarified by stating something similar to "one or more different kinds of said accounting screens".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 3-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipate by Clancey et al. (US Patent 6,134,563).

Clancey et al. discloses the claimed computing method for accounting. Clancey et al. discloses spreadsheet software for creating, displaying, entering of values, computing, printing and saving of accounting spreadsheet screens (first file). Clancey et al. further discloses the creation and display of additional files (second file), such as the "second electronic spreadsheet" disclosed in column 3 lines 53+. Clancey also discloses recalling a spreadsheet after calling the additional files and performing predetermined computations and merging of the files into the additional file, such as

when the "first spreadsheet" is inserted into the recalled "second spreadsheet" as disclosed in column 3, lines 53+. Regarding the printing of the first file, the printing of documents when complete and/or at the time of saving is inherent and common standard practice of users creating documents in order to obtain a hard copy which not only provides the user the ability to easily review and edit the document, to produce copies for distribution, to produce copies for meetings and or reports, to provide back-up of the information in the case the file may become corrupt, etc... Clancey et al. discloses the method being carried out on a personal computer with Excel in column 7 lines 15+ which inherently have the capability to print documents once completed to obtain hard copies.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. In the event Clancey et al. discussed above is found to not inherently disclose the printing of the first file, claims 3-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

As noted above, it is the Examiner's principle position that claims 3-14 are anticipated by Clancey et al. because the printing of files when completed is inherent.

Art Unit: 3627

However if printing of the first file is not found to be inherent, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously old and well known in the practice of data processing and document creation for users to print a document when completed, at the time of saving, in order to obtain a hard copy which not only provides the user the ability to easily review and edit the document, produce copies for distribution and meetings and to provide back-up of the information in the case the file may become corrupt. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Clancey et al. to include the printing of the first spreadsheet (first file) when complete and/or at the time of saving in order to obtain a hard copy which not only provides the user the ability to easily review and edit the document, produce copies for distribution and meetings, and to provide back-up of the information in the case the file may become corrupt.

7. Claims 3-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TurboTax (1997) in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

TurboTax discloses the claimed method for accounting but is silent regarding the creation, storage and printing of the prior year's TurboTax, Quicken or Quickbooks files which are merged (imported) into the next's year's accounting file. Examiner takes Official Notice that the prior year's TurboTax, Quicken or Quickbooks files inherently are created using spreadsheet software, the storage of formulas, use of accounting screens, performance of calculations and creation of a file containing the screens are carried out to produce the files and that the file is saved and printed to provide a back

up and a hard copy for submitting and review. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the method of TurboTax with the creation, storage and printing of the prior year's TurboTax, Quicken or Quickbooks files of Examiner's Official Notice, in order to have created the prior year's TurboTax, Quicken or Quickbooks files used for importing data into the current year's file and to provide a saved back up file and a printed copy for submitting and review.

Quicken and Quickbooks are popular accounting software which inherently carry out standard accounting data gathering and presentation.

As an alternative interpretation, it would be obvious that the 1997 TurboTax file would be saved and printed for submission, and that the 1997 file data could be imported into a 1998 TurboTax file.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant has argued that Clancey fails to teach the steps of (h) thru (l). Examiner contends that these steps are either disclosed or inherent to Clancey. The storing and printing out the first file created is discussed above and is carried out when the first spreadsheet is created, the document is inherently stored on the computer in order to recall the information; a second file is created at the time the second electronic spreadsheet is created; "calling" the second file to "spread and

arrange" after the storing and printing of the first file is performed when the second electronic spreadsheet is viewed; recalling of the first file and performing predetermined calculations based on an accounting method is performed when the first spreadsheet values are automatically inserted into the second spreadsheet; and combining or merging of the first file into the second file is carried out when the values from the first spreadsheet are inserted into the second spreadsheet.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the merging of files to increase the amount of entry space in the input cells, as when combining monthly files to produce yearly results) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### **Conclusion**

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not



Art Unit: 3627

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elaine Gort whose telephone number is (703)308-6391. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703)308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (703)872-9327.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

EG



January 13, 2004



ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600